categorical answer from the hon. Minister.

SHRI TARUN GOGOI: This question is relating to rabi procurement. And rice is khariff procurement. Anyhow, we are taking all the required steps. It is not a fact that we are not taking adequate steps for procurement of rice. We procure rice particularly in Andhra Pradesh. If you have got any suggestion, you can kindly give it to me and I will give you the required particulars.

[*Translation*]

SHRI PHOOL CHAND VERMA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. Minister has stated in his reply that weight loss during storage is allowed at the rate of 20 per cent with effect from July. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that there is no moisture in wheat at the time of its procurement and storage. The question of weight loss of wheat during rainy season does not arise? I want to know, how there was weight loss of 20 per cent whereas there should have been weight gain?

[*English*]

SHRI TARUN GOGOI: I was talking about the losses in the country as a whole. In fact, in certain cases, it goes up and in certain cases, there is a plus point (weight gain) also.

[*Translation*]

DR. LAXMI NARAYAN PANDEYA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it has come to his notice that thousands of quintals of wheat in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh is rotting in the storages due to improper storage facilities. It is unfit for human consumption and it is also unsaleable. Will you improve the storage facilities?

[*English*]

SHRI TARUN GOGOI: I am not aware that it is unfit for human consumption. If you have any concrete evidence, you please bring it to my notice and I will take appropriate action.

[*Translation*]

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana

*226. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the progress of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana has been reviewed in each state:

(b) if so, the details thereof; statewise;

(c) the growth-rate achieved in the rural areas of Uttar Pradesh; and

(d) the manner in which this yojana is proposed to be implemented in future?

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) is an on-going plan scheme of wage employment and it is being reviewed continuously by the Central and the State Governments. The review of the programme is done through Monthly/Quarterly/Annual Progress Reports received from the State Governments. Besides, for effective implementation of the programme, at the instance of Government of India, State's have drawn up a schedule of inspection prescribing minimum number of field visits for each supervisory level officers at the State/District/Block level.

2. The Central Government officers also make field visits to review the qualitative/quantitative aspects of the programme. The Government of India

also convenes occasionally the meeting of State Secretaries and Ministers to review the programme with a view to effect improvement in the quality of its implementation.

3. The State-wise details about expenditure incurred and the employment generatel under JRY during 1990-91 and 1991-92 are given in the Annexure I and II.

4. Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) is a programme of creating additional employment opportunities in the rural areas and is monitored in terms of employment generated. As against the employment generation of 1357.68 lakh mandays during 1988-89, i.e., the last year of implementation of *NREP/RLEGP* in U.P., the employment generation in Uttar Pradesh under JRY during 1989-90 was 1624.63 lakh mandays showing the growth rate of 19.68%. Since the allocation under JRY during 1990-91 had remained at the level of 1989-90, level of employment generation was also the same.

5. The Government has prescribed a highly decentralised manner of implementing the JRY through rural local bodies like *DRDAs/Zilla Parishads at the district level and the Village Panchayats at the Village level. There is no proposal currently under consideration of the Government to change it.

* NREP—NATIONAL RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME.

* RLEGP—RURAL LANDLESS EMPLOYMENT GUARANTEE PROGRAMME.

* DRDAs—DISTRICT RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.

ANNEXURE I

Performance under JRY 1990-91

(*Rs. in Lakhs*)

Sl. No.	*States/UTs.*	*Unutilised balance as on 1-4-90*	*Resources Released*			*Unutilised balance + Resources Released (Col. 3 + 6)*	*Resources utilised*	*%Utilisation to Unutilised balance + funds rel.*	(*In Lakh Mandays*) *Employment Generation*		
			Central	*State Matching Share*	*Total Resources Released (Col. 4 + 5)*				*Target*	*Achievement*	*%Achieved*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Andhra Pradesh .	4788.59	15637.71	3909.43	19547.14	24335.73	18032.89	74.10	919.98	812.60	88.33
2.	Arunachal Pradesh .	240.46	251.31	62.83	314.14	554.60	208.77	37.64	12.40	8.44	68.06
3.	Assam . . .	1843.75	3887.08	872.92	4760.00	6603.75	5648.57	85.54	122.75	126.02	102.66
4.	Bihar . . .	14180.16	29234.83	7308.71	36543.54	50723.70	42645.86	84.07	1125.86	1130.11	100.38
5.	Goa	126.36	142.91	71.45	214.36	340.72	277.12	81.33	11.91	8.88	74.56
6.	Gujarat . . .	2306.70	5712.05	1627.90	7339.95	9646.65	7513.03	77.88	242.72	188.82	77.79
7.	Haryana . . .	222.52	1496.76	535.91	2032.67	2255.19	2085.43	92.47	37.60	35.03	93.16
8.	Himachal Pradesh .	421.68	862.81	215.70	1078.51	1500.19	1270.68	84.70	33.68	35.86	106.47
9.	Jammu & Kashmir .	272.76	1600.00	400.00	2000.00	2272.76	1636.30	72.00	61.68	54.27	87.99
10.	Karnataka . .	2883.91	8550.77	2137.69	10688.46	13572.37	10684.41	78.72	570.87	473.20	82.89
11.	Kerala . . .	1493.48	4332.78	1743.60	6076.38	7569.86	6819.92	90.09	244.83	180.90	73.89

31-03-91

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
12.	Madhya Pradesh	12467.02	19927.61	4981.90	24909.51	37376.53	24102.41	64.49	1156.31	952.76	82.40
13.	Maharashtra	3015.75	15522.87	3880.72	19403.59	22419.34	19254.92	85.89	859.99	850.22	98.86
14.	Manipur	87.77	296.60	153.93	450.53	538.30	482.45	89.62	9.83	12.16	123.70
15.	Meghalaya	195.19	99.18	24.80	123.98	319.17	339.35	106.32	18.98	7.88	41.52
16.	Mizoram	1.64	666.92	166.74	833.66	835.30	833.41	99.77	4.48	19.69	439.51
17.	Nagaland	0.00	483.80	133.66	617.46	617.46	617.46	100.00	21.26	18.98	89.28
18.	Orissa	5109.71	10048.47	2690.60	12739.07	17848.78	12845.26	71.97	324.61	341.97	105.35
19.	Punjab	201.97	1273.49	318.37	1591.86	1793.83	1222.63	68.16	31.72	21.81	68.76
20.	Rajasthan	5990.97	10481.46	2620.37	13101.83	19092.80	17029.54	89.19	392.43	506.01	128.94
21.	Sikkim	60.59	112.36	28.09	140.45	201.04	183.48	91.27	7.91	17.03	215.30
22.	Tamil Nadu	1322.94	13778.93	6287.18	20066.11	21389.05	19661.60	91.92	688.95	755.21	109.62
23.	Tripura	99.78	391.42	118.34	509.76	609.54	525.40	86.20	19.81	19.05	96.16
24.	Uttar Pradesh	9306.57	38830.87	9707.75	48538.62	57845.19	45773.98	79.13	1703.11	1628.27	95.61
25.	West Bengal	8607.37	15856.92	3964.23	19821.15	28428.52	16998.84	59.80	643.16	516.85	80.36
26.	A & N Islands	136.41	78.29	0.00	78.29	214.70	102.02	47.52	4.44	2.97	66.89
27.	Chandigarh	14.57	28.14	0.00	28.14	42.71	12.29	28.78	1.08	0.11	10.19
28.	D & N Haveli	12.72	80.74	0.00	80.74	93.46	66.53	71.19	3.47	2.84	81.84
29.	Daman & Diu	32.35	25.04	0.00	25.04	57.39	15.46	26.94	1.61	0.63	39.13
30.	Delhi	97.03	92.09	0.00	92.09	189.12	56.84	30.05	5.12	0.89	17.38
31.	Lakshadweep	31.85	87.01	4.37	91.38	123.23	64.30	52.18	2.62	2.23	85.11
32.	Pondicherry	18.44	223.79	17.61	241.40	259.84	164.48	63.30	5.87	4.89	83.30
		75591.01	200095.01	53984.79	254079.80	329570.81	257175.63	78.01	9291.04	8736.58	94.03

ANNEXURE II

Performance Under JRY 1991-92

Position as per reports received upto 29-07-91

(*Rs. in lakhs*)

Sl. No	*State/UTs.*	*Month Code*	*Unutilised balance as on 1-4-91*	*Resources allocated*		
				Central (Cash)	*State Share (Cash)*	*Total Resources Allocated*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5	6302.84	15332.96	3833.24	19166.20
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	5	345.83	264.54	66.13	330.67
3.	Assam	6	955.18	4091.67	1022.92	5114.59
4.	Bihar	6	8077.84	30773.42	7693.36	38466.78
5.	Goa	6	63.60	285.82	71.45	357.27
6.	Gujarat	6	2133.62	6472.57	1618.14	8090.71
7.	Haryana	6	169.76	1541.46	385.36	1925.82
8.	Himachal Pradesh	5	229.51	908.22	227.06	1135.28
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	5	636.46	1289.21	322.30	1611.51
10.	Karnataka	6	2887.96	9647.76	2411.94	12059.70
11.	Kerala	5	749.94	5116.95	1279.24	6396.19
12.	Madhya Pradesh	5	13274.12	21122.00	5280.50	26402.50
13.	Maharashtra	5	3164.42	16339.88	4084.97	20424.85
14.	Manipur	6	55.85	339.06	84.77	423.83
15.	Meghalaya	6	0.00	396.73	99.18	495.91
16.	Mizoram	6	1.89	167.12	41.78	208.90
17.	Nagaland	5	0.00	425.26	106.32	531.58
18.	Orissa	5	5003.52	10475.94	2618.99	13094.93
19.	Punjab	5	571.20	1340.52	335.13	1675.65
20.	Rajasthan	5	2063.26	10244.22	2561.06	12805.28
21.	Sikkim	6	17.56	154.83	38.71	193.54
22.	Tamil Nadu	6	1727.45	13778.93	3444.73	17223.66
23.	Tripura	6	84.14	440.39	110.10	550.49
24.	Uttar Pradesh	6	12071.21	40874.62	10218.66	51093.28
25.	West Bengal	6	11429.68	17429.55	4357.39	21786.94
26.	A & N Islands	6	112.68	156.56	0.00	156.56
27.	Chandigarh	4	30.42	38.81	0.00	38.81
28.	D & N Haveli	6	26.93	84.99	0.00	84.99
29.	Daman & Diu	6	41.93	50.07	0.00	50.07
30.	Delhi	5	132.28	184.18	0.00	184.18
31.	Lakshadweep	6	58.93	78.49	0.00	78.49
32.	Pondicherry	6	95.36	153.25	0.00	153.25
			72515.37	210000.00	52313.37	262313.37

(*Rs. in lakhs*)

Sl. No.	*State/UTs.*	*Month Code*	*Total Resources Released*			*Total Availability*
			Central	*State matching share*	*Total*	*Unutilised Bal. + Released*
1	2	3	8	9	10	11
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5	5110.99	1277.75	6388.74	12691.58
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	5	11.25	2.81	14.06	359.89
3.	Assam	6	1387.65	346.91	1734.56	2689.74
4.	Bihar	6	6668.52	1667.13	8335.65	16413.49
5.	Goa	6	@	@	@	63.60
6.	Gujarat	6	2206.36	551.59	2757.95	4891.57
7.	Haryana	6	1052.54	263.14	1315.68	1485.44
8.	Himachal Pradesh	5	434.49	108.62	543.11	772.62
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	5	1001.23	250.31	1251.54	1888.00
10.	Karnataka	6	4338.66	1084.67	5423.33	8311.29
11.	Kerala	5	1705.65	426.41	2132.06	2882.00
12.	Madhya Pradesh	5	4387.62	1096.91	5484.53	18758.65
13.	Maharashtra	5	4694.52	1173.63	5868.15	9032.57
14.	Manipur	6	@	@	@	55.85
15.	Meghalaya	6	60.00	15.00	75.00	75.00
16.	Mizoram	6	71.31	17.83	89.14	91.03
17.	Nagaland	5	141.75	35.44	177.19	177.19
18.	Orissa	5	2249.11	562.28	2811.39	7814.91
19.	Punjab	5	811.21	202.80	1014.01	1585.21
20.	Rajasthan	5	3344.84	836.21	4181.05	6244.31
21.	Sikkim	6	51.61	12.90	64.51	82.07
22.	Tamil Nadu	6	4592.97	1148.24	5741.21	7468.66
23.	Tripura	6	180.49	45.12	225.61	309.75
24.	Uttar Pradesh	6	12263.52	3065.88	15329.40	27400.61
25.	West Bengal	6	2823.20	705.80	3529.00	14958.68
26.	A & N Islands	6	21.00	0.00	21.00	133.68
27.	Chandigarh	4	@	@	@	30.42
28.	D & N Haveli	6	@	@	@	26.93
29.	Daman & Diu	6	@	@	@	41.93
30.	Delhi	5	@	@	@	132.28
31.	Lakshadweep	6	*	*	*	58.93
32.	Pondicherry	6	51.08	0.00	51.08	146.44
			59661.57	14897.37	74558.94	147074.31

@Complete proposals is not received.

*Requisite level of expenditure to available resources not yet attained by the U.T. to qualify for release of funds.

(*Rs. in lakhs*)

S. No.	*State/UTs.*	*Month Code*	*Rs. in lakhs Resources Utilised*	*%age utilisation*	*(In Lakhs Mandays) Employment generation*		
				Unutilised Bal. + Released	*Target*	*Achievement*	*% age Achievement*
1	2	3	12	13	14	15	16
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5	1121.52	8.84	919.98	55.39	6.02
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	5	6.89	1.91	12.40	0.18	1.45
3.	Assam	6	556.08	20.67	122.75	12.62	10.28
4.	Bihar	6	6444.73	39.26	1125.86	157.44	13.98
5.	Goa	6	50.79	79.86	11.91	1.33	11.17
6.	Gujarat	6	1187.94	24.29	242.72	25.68	10.58
7.	Haryana	6	163.65	11.02	37.60	2.63	6.99
8.	Himachal Pradesh	5	107.70	13.94	34.06	3.23	9.48
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	5	67.49	3.57	61.68	1.82	2.95
10.	Karnataka	6	1497.42	18.02	433.93	63.06	14.53
11.	Kerala	5	966.38	33.53	244.83	24.86	10.15
12.	Madhya Pradesh	5	3632.34	19.36	1156.31	131.45	11.37
13.	Maharashtra	5	982.88	10.88	859.99	42.09	4.89
14.	Manipur	6	4.48	8.02	9.83	0.11	1.12
15.	Meghalaya	6	132.10	176.13	18.98	3.24	17.07
16.	Mizoram	6	0.00	0.00	4.48	0.00	0.00
17.	Nagaland	5	0.00	0.00	21.26	0.00	0.00
18.	Orissa	5	950.71	12.17	306.02	22.61	7.39
19.	Punjab	5	196.29	12.38	29.57	3.38	11.43
20.	Rajasthan	5	2240.02	35.87	338.84	67.67	19.97
21.	Sikkim	6	20.82	25.37	7.91	0.92	11.63
22.	Tamil Nadu	6	948.25	12.70	688.95	34.13	4.95
23.	Tripura	6	51.44	16.61	19.81	1.58	7.98
24.	Uttar Pradesh	6	3518.51	12.84	1705.11	112.81	6.62
25.	West Bengal	6	3442.34	23.01	554.96	85.95	15.49
26.	A & N Islands	6	10.46	7.82	4.44	0.37	8.33
27.	Chandigarh	4	0.20	0.66	0.70	Neg	0.00
28.	D & N Haveli	6	11.95	44.37	3.47	0.71	20.46
29.	Daman & Diu	6	11.09	26.45	1.61	0.37	22.98
30.	Delhi	5	7.12	5.38	3.83	0.08	2.09
31.	Lakshadweep	6	11.84	20.09	2.62	0.54	20.61
32.	Pondicherry	6	20.57	14.05	4.06	0.69	17.00
			28364.00	19.29	8988.47	856.94	9.53

[*Translation*]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, two years ago, there were three schemes in operation in rural areas, namely the National Rural Employment Programme, Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme, Integrated Rural Development Programme. Now, all these three schemes have been merged with Jawahar Rozgar Yojana to check extravagant expenditure at official levels, so that the villagers could benefit. It is a matter of regret that during the same year...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You are delivering a long speech, then you will complain that no reply is given to your question. You put a pointed question.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: In 1989, out of Rs. 2700 crore, after making an adjustment Rs. 700 crore by way of interest, Rs. 2,100 crore were allocated. I don't want to discuss all that has appeared in the press. My point is whether it has been reviewed or not during these two years. From the reply it appears that this programme is going on successfully in the villages and it is the best programme for rural areas.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing all these things. Please come to the quetsion.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: My question was whether this scheme has been reviewed?..... *(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: He wants to know whether you have examined this scheme or not.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Gangwar, if you make a long speech, your question will be long. Then you will not get the answer. So, please put a pointed question.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR : Has any appraisal of this scheme been done by any non-governmental agency or has done by the hon. Minister received any report about it

SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY: There is nothing o fthat sort.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the year 1989 the then Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi had said that this issue needed a National debate. Jawahar Rozgar Yojana is a programme linked with the two-third population of this country. Is the Government thinking to hold a debate on it and to reconsider this programme?

SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY: Yes, the Govt. is doing so.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Giri, I will allow you later on. The Prime Minister would like to supplement.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): I think the time has come when we must have an independent appraisal of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana. We have had the yojana for two to three years now. I will take some steps to initiate that appraisal. I am always ready for a discussion because this is something on which there can be no last word. Any suggestion, any criticism coming from any quarter is welcome. I would initiate some steps to see that some independent appraisal is made of the entire Yojana.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI: Sir, huge amounts of money have been spent for the upliftment of the poor in the rural areas. But I would like to know whether the Government have devised any mechanism to check the malpractices that might be taking place at any stage in the distribution system.

31-04.Tm

SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY: Regarding checks on malpractices, it is not clear from which side...

MR. SPEAKER: He has asked whether there is any mechanism to check malpractices that might have come to your notice.

SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY: The State Government looks into the matter. This is a state subject and the action is taken by the State Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any mechanism?

SHRI G. VENKAT SWAMY: Yes. There is a mechanism. The Panchayat Raj Ministry of the State Government takes care of this aspect.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is a mechanism at the State level. But as I said it is fragmentary in the sense that at every level there is a mechanism and there does not appear to be a collation and coordination of the whole and in any case we do not have a national picture of the whole thing. That is why, we must have this appraised properly. Only then, we will be able to come to a right conclusion. This is a Yojana. This is not a party matter at all. This is concerned with very vital interests of the people. I would like to get this appraisal done, in the course of which I would like hon. members and others—everyone from every quarter—to come and tell us what is to be done and how it can be done.

SHRI DIGVIJAYA SINGH: In the reply submitted, the percentage of utilisation of the funds in this Yojana is 78.01. The percentage of utilisation of the mandays' target is 94.8, in the year 1990-91. And in the year 1991-92, the fund utilisation is 19 per cent while the mandays' target utilisation is only nine per cent. Obviously, there is some kind of fudging in the reports being submitted by the State Governments. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister through you whether the Government have received any complaints of any State Governments utilising these funds meant for the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana for paying their own salaries and to make some other payments as well. Will the Prime Minister look into the matter and have it examined?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: If there are any complaints, we will certainly look into them. I have just submitted that the whole programme is two years old and it is time to have a look into it to find out what is happening at the State Government level. It is possible that some State Governments might be diverting these funds to purposes other than those for which they are intended but I would not like to make a sweeping statement on that. We will look into all this. And after this I don't think there is any need for further supplementaries because once this appraisal is done, we will have a clearer picture.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI: You have just said in your reply that both the Central and State Governments have control over it. In your reply you have stated in detail as to how the Central Government controls it. I would not like to go into details. On this very subject I had put a question in the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly. There is lot of corruption in it. Eastern Uttar Pradesh.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Come to your question please.

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI: Sir, about 1000 corruption cases were reported. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what remedial steps they take to check corruption in the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana in various states. Are they aware of the corruption or not? (*Interruptions*)

Sir, I did not get answer to my question.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: It has already been answered.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI: No; he did not answer about Uttar Pradesh.

MR. SPEAKER: He has said that an appraisal is going to be made. He has invited your suggestions.

[*English*]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Sir, in the rural areas the three schemes for the wage earners—NREP, RLEGP and DRDS—have been combined. I must say that this is one of the very popular schemes which takes the money straight from the grass root level to the village level. But the money is so inadequate that whatever work is done during a year—and it is always incomplete—next year it is washed away or something like that happens. It largely goes waste. Keeping in mind that the scheme itself is good but the money supplied is inadequate, whether the Central Government is proposing to increase the money and also request the State Governments that they should also increase their matching grounds, because that is very inadequate, so that this scheme can function usefully.

MR. SPEAKER: His question is, will more funds be made available.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, before we think of augmenting the fund, I think the time has come when we have a thorough look into how the funds are being spent right now, because hon. Members have suggested that there is so much irregularity and so on. So, this is the time for reappraisal and after that we can think of augmenting the funds if we are able to.

White Paper on the Status of Heavy Industries

*228. SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government propose to bring out a White Paper on the status of heavy industries in the country;

(b) if so, when;

(c) whether the heavy industries which are suffering losses would also be revamped; and

(d) if so, the steps proposed to be taken to improve the performance of these industries?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P. K. THUNGON): (a) and (b) There is no proposal at present to bring out a White Paper on the status of Heavy Industries in the Country.

(c) and (d) New industrial policy which has been recently announced lays adequate emphasis on modernisation of industries in general through a liberalised scheme of technology upgradation. In addition, there is already an existing scheme under which chronically sick industrial units are referred to BIFR for a detailed study and its recommendations for revival/rehabilitation.

SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, even in new Industrial Policy the Government has not proposed any specific corrective measures to revamp the chronically sick heavy industries. In view of this, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether Government proposes to take any specific corrective measures in this regard. Just referring the cases to BIFR will not do. BIFR is there since the last 15 years. But what results it has achieved, the entire world knows. So, I would like to know what specific